



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

HI

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,702	02/22/2002	Gregory P. Fitzpatrick	BOC9-2001-0025 (271)	1267
40987	7590	06/13/2007		
AKERMAN SENTERFITT P. O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			EXAMINER FISHER, MICHAEL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/081,702	Applicant(s) FITZPATRICK ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael J. Fisher	Art Unit 3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PAT 7,003,546 to Cheah.

As to claims 1,7,15,30, Cheah discloses a method of connecting business comprising identifying a plurality of business to participate in an online registry (col 2, lines 13-21), storing business profiles comprising business attributes (col 6, lines 29-31), searching the online registry to locate the information (col 6, lines 50-62), establishing contact between the inquiring business and the located business (col 6, lines 54-56).

Cheah does not, however, teach determining whether the inquiring businesses are competitors from customer lists and restricting access if the businesses are competitors. Cheah does, however, teach only allowing "consenting users" to be able to view each other's data (fig 4, 404), therefore, it would be obvious to allow companies to deny a competitor to access their customer's information so as not allow a business to gather a competitor's customers.

As to claims 16,22, as the system is shown to be on a computer (computer network), it would inherently be on a machine readable storage device as a machine reads the data.

As to claims 2,17, the business registry would conform to UDDI as HTML would meet this limitation, as discussed in the specification, and the system is shown to use HTML (col 28, lines 45-49).

As to claims 3,18, the business information includes business identity information (inherent in that the business is identified), business description information (inherent in that the requestor is requesting a specific type of business) and communications information (contact information as discussed).

As to claims 4,19, as the contact information is provided, it would inherently be extracted.

As to claims 5,20, Cheah discloses defining access rights and defining permissible contacts (col 6, lines 40-42, "...information is able to be distributed to registered users..."), and defining selected business attributes as private (PID, via PID generator 214).

As to claims 6,21, the businesses are authenticated (col 10, lines 43-51).

As to claims 8,23, the communication link is established according to business attributes (inherent in that the request is for a specific type of business).

As to claims 9,24, the business identity is the type of business.

As to claims 10,25, as Cheah discloses similar businesses contacting each other, they would inherently share a business attribute, thereby meeting the limitations as claimed.

As to claims 11,26, the attributes are business identity information and business description information (necessary as they are identified and described to potential

Art Unit: 3629

contactors) and communications information (inherent in that they are communicated with).

As to claims 12,27, the business registry would conform to UDDI as HTML would meet this limitation, as discussed in the specification, and the system is shown to use HTML (col 28, lines 45-49).

As to claims 13,28, Cheah discloses defining access rights and defining permissible contacts (col 6, lines 40-42, "...information is able to be distributed to registered users..."), and defining selected business attributes as private (PID, via PID generator 214).

As to claims 14,29, the businesses are authenticated (col 10, lines 43-51).

As to claim 31, the communication link is inherently and necessarily established according to communication information.

As to claim 32, the information would include contact information (title), this would inherently include who they are contacting.

As to claim 33, the link would inherently be chosen based on who is being contacted.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3629

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Fisher whose telephone number is 571-272-6804. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30am-5:00pm alt Fri. off.


The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael Fisher



Patent Examiner
GAU 3629

MF 
6/7/06